

IN THE DRAWINGS

Submitted herewith is a replacement sheet which includes Fig. 2, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4. Applicant has amended Fig. 2 in which the reference y has been deleted.

Approval is requested.

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-22 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1-4 and 7-22 are rejected. Claim 5 is objected to. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 13-18 are amended. Claims 5, 6, 9-12 and 19-22 have been cancelled. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 13-18 remain.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

It is asserted in the Office Action that Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In response, Applicant has cancelled Claim 11.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 11 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is requested.

It is asserted in the Office Action that Claims 9, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In response, Applicant has cancelled Claims 9, 10 and 11.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 9, 10 and 11 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is requested.

It is asserted in the Office Action that the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In response, Applicant has amended Fig. 2 in which the reference y has been deleted. In addition, the specification, at page 5, paragraph [0054], has also been amended deleting the reference y which resulted from an incorrect translation of the French priority application.

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) is respectfully requested.

It is asserted in the Office Action that Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by any one of Morgan, Bayer et al., and Zeller et al. In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 5 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 2-4, 7 and 8 have been amended to depend from newly amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 11-4, 7 and 8 under 35 USC 102(b) is respectfully requested.

It is asserted in the Office Action that Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of Morgan, Bayer et al., and Zeller et al.

In response, Applicant has cancelled Claims 9-12.

Approval is respectfully requested.

It is asserted in the Office Action that Claims 18-22 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form. In addition, Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bayer et al. or Zeller et al.

In response, Applicant has amended Claim 18 to depend from allowable Claim 1 and has cancelled Claims 19-22 in response to the above rejections.

Approval is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 13-18 patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated:

10/27/08

By: _____

Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Linda Metz
Linda Metz

10/27/08
Date: October 27, 2008